

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:	10/808,085	Confirmation No.:	5362
Applicant	: John RATZLOFF		
Filed	: March 24, 2004		
Group Art Unit	: 2854		
Examiner	: Jill E. Culler		
Title	: HINGE STRIPS FOR PRINTER PAPER		
Docket No.	: 1282.1101101		
Customer No.	: 28075		


APPLICANT'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE FOR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being electronically transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on this 25th day of

February, 2008.

By


Rachel Gagliardi

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her courtesy during a telephonic interview conducted on February 7, 2008, with the Applicant's appointed attorney, Jason W. Burgmaier. This Interview Summary is submitted in consideration of Applicant's obligation to provide a written statement of the substance of the Interview in view of 37 CFR 1.133 (b). These remarks are believed to sufficiently characterize and summarize the discussion conducted during the Interview.

The discussion was directed to the Applicant's position that it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to combine the teachings of Truc et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,911,777, with those of Hunter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,071,030. Namely, it was asserted that the teachings of Hunter, combined with those of Truc, do not suggest to one of skill in the art an assembly as claimed in claim 3 which can be sent through a printer, and then mounting the assembly in an album using the claimed mounting strip of the assembly.

It was pointed out that Truc teaches a hanging file mount at FIGS. 5 and 6, and Truc teaches a ring binder mount at FIGS. 7 and 8. In formulating the rejection, the Examiner acknowledged her reliance on the hanging file mount at FIGS. 5 and 6 in formulating the rejection of the claims. Applicant's representative pointed out that one of skill in the art would not be inclined to look to a hanging file mount in an attempt to modify the divider sheet taught in Hunter. Specifically, it was noted that the metal hanger 48, which the Examiner acknowledged as being equated to the claimed mounting strip, would not be able to pass through the radii of bends in the sheet path necessary for the divider sheet of Hunter to be sent through a printer. In light of M.P.E.P. §2143.01, it was indicated that modifying the divider sheet of Hunter with the hanging file mount of Truc would render the divider sheet of Hunter unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of being able to be fed through a printer without jamming, thus negating a finding of obviousness.


Although no agreement was reached during the Interview, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the substance of the Interview.

Respectfully submitted,

John RATZLOFF

By his attorney,

Date: 2-25-2008


Jason W. Burgmaier, Reg. No. 57,222
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420
Tel: (612) 677-9050